REMARKS

The present application includes pending claims 1-39, all of which are rejected. Claims 14 and 31 have been amended.

Claims 31-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 2005/0028208 ("Ellis"). Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of U.S. 2002/0143959 ("El-Baze"). Claims 25-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis in view of U.S. 2003/0097655 ("Novak"). The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least reasons previously discussed during prosecution and the following:

I.   The Rejection Of Claims 31-39 As Being Anticipated By Ellis

Claim 31 recites, in part, "software that receives a request identifying a network address and authorization information, via the communication interface, and responds by coordinating the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system." The Office Action acknowledges that "Ellis is unclear regarding devices on a network having an associated network address." *See* April 16, 2008 Office Action at page 14. Thus, the Applicants respectfully submit that Ellis does not describe, teach or suggest "software that receives **a request identifying a network address and authorization information**, via the communication interface, **and responds [to that request identifying a network address] by coordinating the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system.**" Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 31-39.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1-24 Over Ellis In View Of El-Baze

Claim 1 recites, in part, "server software that . . . responds [to a request that identifies one or more of the associated first, second, and/or third network addresses and authorization information] by identifying at least one other of the one or more of the associated first, second, and/or third network addresses to support the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system." Thus, claim 1 is clear that there is (1) a request that **identifies** one of more of the associated first, second and/or third network addresses **and** authorization information and (2) in response to that request, the server software identifies at least one other of the one or more of the associated first, second and/or or third network addresses to support the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system. Thus, the request identifies (a) the first, second and/or third network addresses **and** (b) authorization information. In response to that request, the server software identifies another of the first, second and/or third network addresses. The Office Action has not shown where any of the cited references disclose such limitations.

The Office Action acknowledges that "Ellis is unclear regarding devices on a network having an associated network address." *See* April 16, 2008 Office Action at page 14. Thus, Ellis cannot describe, teach or suggest "server software that . . . responds [to a request that identifies one or more of the associated first, second, and/or third network addresses and authorization information] by identifying at least one other of the one or more of the associated first, second, and/or third network addresses to support the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system."

In order to overcome this deficiency, the Office Action cites El-Baze. *See id.* The Office Action particularly cites El-Baze at [0065] -[0069], [0089], [0085] and [0070]-[0074]. *See* April

16, 2008 Office Action at pages 14-15. El-Baze does disclose a computing device that is

"logged onto an Address Locator 50." *See* El-Baze at [0089]. Further, El-Baze discloses the

following:

> The Request Initiator 31 gets a request from the application
> program to initiate a streaming signal process, the IP address of the
> of the originating computing device 11 and the target remote
> computing device. Its' [sic] role is to obtain the IP address of the
> remote computing device 12. Upon determining the net addresses
> of the computing devices, it passes an instruction to the Link
> Establishment module 32 for a channel setup, that in turn passes
> the network addresses to the Channel Control module 36.

El-Baze at [0085]. As shown above, this portion of El-Baze discloses a request to initiate a

streaming signal process, and apparently to "initiate" an IP address of the originating computing

device and the target computing device. Thus, this portion of El-Baze discloses that the request

is to "initiate" (1) a streaming signal process, (2) the IP address of the originating device 11 and

(3) the IP address of the target device 12. After the IP addresses are "determined," a channel

setup instruction is set up that passes the addresses to the channel control module.

However, the Office Action has not shown where the cited references describe, teach or

suggest (1) a request that identifies one of more of the associated first, second and/or third

network addresses **and** authorization information and (2) **in response to that request**, the server

software **identifies at least one other of the one or more of the associated first, second and/or**

or third network addresses to support the delivery of media to the at least one vehicle system.

Thus, for at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the

rejection of claims 1-13.

Claim 14 recites, in part, "server software that receives a request identifying a first

network address and authorization information, via the communication network, and responds by

identifying a second network address to coordinate the delivery of media to the at least one

vehicle system." For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, the Applicants

respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 14-24.

III.   The Rejection Of Claims 25-30 Over Ellis In View Of Novak

Claim 25 recites, in part, "determining if the vehicle system is available to receive the

selected media" The Office Action cites Ellis at [0152] and [0153] as disclosing this limitation.

This cited portion of Ellis recites the following:

> FIG. 15 shows illustrative steps involved in remotely providing
> program listings information to a user. At step 1600, program
> listings information is remotely obtained from the local interactive
> television program guide implemented on interactive television
> program guide equipment 17 via remote access link 19. The
> remote access program guide may, for example, obtain this
> information on startup, periodically, continuously, on demand in
> response to a suitable user command, or using any other suitable
> scheme using remote program guide access device 24.
>
> At step 1610, the program listings information may be provided to
> the user. The program listings information may be displayed for
> the user by the remote access program guide in a table, listing grid,
> or other suitable construct, using user interface 52 (substep 1620).
> Alternatively, program listings information may be provided
> audibly for the user by using, for example, a speaker (substep
> 1630).

Ellis at [0152]-[0153]. This cited portion of Ellis discloses that program listing information is

remotely obtained. The information may be displayed to the user in a table, listing grid, or the

like. It does not describe, teach or suggest, however, "determining if the vehicle system is

available to receive the selected media," as recited in claim 25. Thus, for at least this reason, the

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 25-30.

Claim 25 also recites, in part, "receiving authorization information from the vehicle system." The Office Action cites Ellis at [0154] as disclosing this limitation. *See* April 16, 2008 Office Action at page 22. This cited portion of Ellis recites the following:

> At step 1640, the remote access program guide may provide the user with the opportunity to select a program listing. In response to such a selection, the remote access program guide may provide the user with the opportunity to access other remote program guide features for the listing (e.g., displays additional info, schedule a program reminder, record, parental control, order the program if it is a pay-per-view program, etc.).

Ellis at [0154]. This portion of Ellis discloses that a user may be provided an opportunity to selecting a program listing. In response to the selection, the user may be provided the opportunity to gain access to other features, such as additional information, scheduling a program reminder, and order a pay-per view program. However, it does not describe, teach or suggest "receiving authorization information **from the vehicle system**," as recited in claim 25. Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 25-30.

IV.   Conclusion

In general, the Office Action makes various statements regarding the pending claims and the cited references that are now moot in light of the above. Thus, the Applicants will not address such statements at the present time. The Applicants expressly reserve the right, however, to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise (e.g., if such statement should become relevant by appearing in an Examiner's Answer to an Appeal Brief).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the claims should be allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. If the Examiner has any questions or the Applicants can be of any assistance, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any necessary fees, or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2008

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312)775-8100

/Joseph M. Butscher/
Joseph M. Butscher
Registration No. 48,326